



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/530,081

12/30/2005

Henrik Balle

891.012171-US (PAR)

7461

2512

7590

07/07/2009

PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER

TORRES, MARCOS L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/07/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/530,081	Applicant(s) BALLE ET AL.	
	Examiner MARCOS L. TORRES	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 38-44, 46-53, 56, 58, 59, 61-74, 77, 78, 81, 82 and 86-98 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 38-44, 46-53, 56, 58, 59, 61-74, 77, 78, 81, 82 and 86-98 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6-4-09 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. As to the arguments directed to the Ali, Larson and Sewrup references, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Also, applicant assert that Ali fails to teach interchanging the first control content and the second control content such that the first control content is adjacent the second input key and the second control content is adjacent the first input key. As correctly pointed by the applicant Ali discloses the rotation of the display through all four orthogonal

rotation (see par. 0070), unfortunately the drawings only show two positions. However, it is noted that the “first and second control content” are the label in the screen of the programmable buttons 30 and 31. As shown by the secondary references Larson and Sewrup when the device is rotated in more than one direction the buttons are also rotated to simplify the use of the device (see for example fig. 1-3 in Sewrup and fig. 6-9 in Larson). Because if the function of the keys changes it would be obvious that the label indicating the function would also change to correctly indicate to the user the correct function (see for example that in Sewrup the arrow functions and numbers are interchanged). Therefore, when combined the references it would be obvious to also change the screen label “control content” to reflect the rotation changes of the buttons.

4. In response to applicant's arguments that Elsmore fails to disclose wherein the device receives from another device, the terminal display receive the data from the host as correctly pointed out by the applicant, it is noted that the terminal display and the host computer are not the same device as seen in fig. 3.

5. In response to applicant's arguments that in Elsmore there is no disclosure of the composing of content at a further device, which content is later received at the device, the terminal display itself produces no content, the content at a further device is done by the host as pointed in the section of col. 2 cited by the applicant.

6. The rest of the arguments they fall for the same reasons as shown in paragraphs 3-5 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 71, 78, 88, 90 and 95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Elsmore 4683469.

As to claim 71, Elsmore discloses a method comprising: receiving, at a device [20], first information content composed on a further device in a display area [12] having a first size; reducing the size of a variable display area on a display of the device from a current size to a first size; and displaying, on the display of the device, the received first information content within the reduced display area, wherein the whole of the received first information content is displayed within the reduced display area (see col. 3, line 32 – col. 4, line 34; col. 4, lines 58 – col. 5, line 59).

As to claim 78, Elsmore discloses a method, comprising: receiving, from a device [10], information content composed in a display area [12] of a first size on the device, wherein the information content includes a plurality of alphanumeric characters; a received information content in a display area of a second size, wherein the alphanumeric characters of the information content are displayed, in the display area of the second size, over a plurality of lines; and changing the size of the display area to display the received information content in the form that it was composed, by changing the size of the display area from the second size to the first size, thereby changing the

number of alphanumeric characters that are displayed in a line of the information content (see col. 3, line 32 – col. 4, line 34; col. 4, lines 58 – col. 5, line 59).

As to claim 88, Elsmore disclose a device wherein the first information content is a text message comprising alphanumeric characters (see col. 1, lines 12-27).

As to claim 90, Elsmore discloses a device wherein the number of alphanumeric characters that are displayed in a line of the information content is changed without increasing the number of alphanumeric characters in the displayed information content, and without reducing the number of alphanumeric characters in the displayed information content [changes only the columns] (see col. 3, lines 32 – col. 5, line 59).

As to claim 95 is the corresponding computer memory claims of method claim 78. Therefore, claim 95 is rejected for the same reasons as shown above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claims 38-44, 46-52, 92-94 and 96-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ali US 20030197679A1 in view of Swerup 20020177464.

As to claim 38, Ali discloses a device (see fig. 5; par. 0053) (see fig. 8b, item 811,813,815,817; par. 0067), comprising: first and second input key associated with a display (see fig. 8a, items 870; par. 0069); a display being configured to display information content with a first orientation, first control content, adjacent the first input key, indicating that the first input key has a first function, and second control content, adjacent the second input key, indicating that the second input key has a second function (see fig. 8a, 8b, item 740, 820); and a processor, for controlling the display (see par. 0060), configured to vary the first orientation of the information content to all four orthogonal orientations (see fig. 8b and 8c, par. 0066-0070). Ali does not specifically disclose to interchange the first control content and the second control content, such

Art Unit: 2617

that the first control is adjacent the second input key and the second control content is adjacent the first input key, because Ali only shows tilting the device to one side in the drawings. However, note in the figures above that Ali desires to maintain the order of the input keys, this is most likely because it would be troublesome to the user if he have to learn a new configuration layout to each mode. In another analogous art, Swerup discloses to interchange the first function and second function, such that second input key has the first function and vice versa (see par. 0027, 0028, 0037). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interchange the functions to maintain the same order so if user is used to a button in certain place maintaining the correspondence when the device is rotated, thereby providing the user an easy to learn user interface regardless of the position of the device.

As to claim 39, Ali discloses a device further comprising a user input device, Wherein the processor is configured to vary the user-determined orientation of the information content, in response to input from the user input device (see fig. 8b and 8c, par. 0060-0061, 0066-0070).

As to claim 40, Ali discloses a device wherein the functionality of the user input device is controlled by the processor (see par. 0060).

As to claim 41, Ali discloses a device wherein the processor is configured to vary the user-determined orientation of the information content between four predetermined orientations (portrait or landscape, see fig. 8b, 8c; par. 0066, 0070).

As to claim 42, Ali discloses a mobile device wherein the processor is configured to vary the user determined orientation of the information content by successive increments of 90 degrees rotation about a first origin in the display (portrait or landscape, see fig. 8b, 8c; par. 0066, 0070).

As to claim 43, Ali discloses a mobile device wherein the processor is configured to vary the user-determined orientation of the information content while it is displayed (see par. 0060).

As to claim 44, Ali discloses a device wherein the first and second control content for the input key varies as the function of the first and second input key is varied by the processor (see par. 0068, 0060).

As to claim 46, Ali discloses a device wherein the first and second control content have a fixed orientation with respect to the mobile device (see fig. 8b, 8c).

As to claim 47, Ali discloses a mobile device wherein the processor is configured to rotate the information content about a first origin and simultaneously rotate the first and second control content about a second different origin, by ninety degrees (see fig. 8b, 8c).

As to claim 48, Ali discloses a mobile device wherein the processor is configured to simultaneously rotate the information content and the first and second control content, in response to input from the user input device (see par. 0066).

As to claim 49, Ali discloses a device wherein the first origin and the second origin are fixed (see fig. 8b, 8c).

As to claim 50-52 and 97, they are the corresponding method claims of device claims 38-39 and 96. Therefore, claims 50-52 and 97 are rejected for the same reasons as shown above.

As to claim 92-94 and 98, they are the corresponding computer memory claims of device claims 38-39 and 96. Therefore, claims 92-94 and 98 are rejected for the same reasons as shown above.

As to claim 96, Ali discloses a device wherein the processor is further configured to vary the orientation of the information content to a third orientation, to not interchange the first function and the second function; and to not interchange the first control content and second control content (see fig. 8b and 8c, par. 0066-0070). Ali does not specifically disclose that the second input key has the first function and the first control content is adjacent the second input key and such that the first input key has the second function and the second control content is adjacent the first input key. In other words, this situation occurs when the functions were already rotated. In another analogous art, Swerup discloses to interchange the first function and second function, such that second input key has the first function and vice versa (see par. 0027, 0028, 0037). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interchange the functions when the device is rotated 180 degrees to maintain the same order so if user is used to a button in certain place maintaining the correspondence when the device is rotated, thereby providing the user an easy to learn user interface regardless of the position of the device; and to repeat the steps of fig 8b and 8c in the subsequent position change of 90 degrees. Also, it is noted that if the

position change in the reverse direction, it would be obvious to reverse the steps because it would bring the same predictable result of maintaining correspondence.

13. Claims 53, 56, 58-59, 61-62, 65, 77, 81-82, 86-87, 89 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elsmore 4683469 in view of Sameshima 20020158889.

As to claims 53 and 61, Elsmore discloses a device [20], comprising: a display [10] having a surface area for displaying information content, wherein the whole of any information content in the display area is displayed by the display; configured to receive, from a further device, first information content composed on the further device, and to receive a parameter indicating the size of the display area in which the first information content was composed on the further device; and a processor configured to determine, in response to reception of the parameter [timing], the size indicated in the parameter, and to control the display to display the received first information content in a display area having the indicated size, in order to display the information content in the form in which it was composed on the further device (see col. 3, lines 32 – col. 5, line 59).

Elsmore does not specifically disclose a radio frequency receiver. In an analogous art, Sameshima discloses a radio frequency receiver [301] in a display device (see par. 0018-0020). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to add a radio receiver to permit wireless communication with multiple devices while displaying using the desired displaying mode.

As to claim 56, Elsmore discloses a device wherein the information content originates in another device [20] and is received in display [10] (see col. 3, lines 32 – col. 5, line 59). Elsmore does not specifically disclose a radio frequency receiver. In an analogous art, Sameshima discloses a radio frequency receiver [301] in a display device and receiving the data by radio frequency (see par. 0018-0020). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to add a radio receiver to permit wireless communication with multiple devices while displaying using the desired displaying mode.

As to claim 58, Elsmore discloses a device wherein the information content is alphanumeric text data (see col. 3, lines 32 – col. 5, line 59).

As to claim 59, Elsmore discloses a device wherein the processor, provides a text message handling application in which the display area for the text message is variable dependence upon the received parameter (see col. 3, lines 32 – col. 5, line 59).

As to claim 62, Elsmore discloses a device [20], comprising: a display [10] having variable display area information content wherein the whole of any information content in the variable display area is displayed by the display (see col. 3, line 32 – col. 4, line 34); configured to receive, from a further device [host computer], first information content composed on the further device in a display area having a first size; and processor configured to reduce the size of the variable display area from a current size to the first size, and to display the received first information content in the display area of the first size (see col. 4, lines 58 – col. 5, line 59). Elmsore does not specifically disclose a radio frequency receiver. In an analogous art, Sameshima discloses a radio

frequency receiver [301] in a display device (see par. 0018-0020). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to add a radio receiver to permit wireless communication with multiple devices while displaying using the desired displaying mode.

As to claim 65, Elsmore discloses a device wherein the first and second areas are predetermined sizes (see col. 3, line 32 – col. 4, line 34).

As to claim 77, Elsmore discloses a device [20], configured to receive, from a further device, information content composed in a display [10] area of a first size on the further device, wherein the information content includes a plurality of alphanumeric characters; a display configured to display the received information content in a display area of a second size, wherein the alphanumeric characters of the information content are displayed, in the display area of the second size, over a plurality of lines (see col. 3, line 32 – col. 4, line 34); and to control the display the received information content in the form that it was composed, by changing the size of display area displaying the received information content from the second size to the first size, thereby changing the number of alphanumeric characters that are displayed in a line of the information content (see col. 4, lines 58 – col. 5, line 59). Elsmore does not specifically disclose a radio frequency receiver. In an analogous art, Sameshima discloses a radio frequency receiver [301] in a display device (see par. 0018-0020). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to add a radio receiver to permit wireless communication with multiple devices while displaying using the desired displaying mode.

As to claim 81, Elsmore discloses a device wherein the processor is configured in response to determining the display area size in the parameter, to change the size of a current display area from a current size to the indicated size (see col. 3, lines 32 – col. 5, line 59).

As to claim 82, Elsmore discloses a device wherein the processor changes the size of the display area from the second size to the first size, the size of each alphanumeric character remains the same [changes only the columns] (see col. 3, lines 32 – col. 5, line 59).

As to claim 86, the primary references does not disclose a device further comprising a user input device, wherein the processor is configured to reduce the size of the variable display area from a current size to the first size in response to input from the user input device. In an analogous art, Sameshima discloses a device further comprising a user input device, wherein the processor is configured to reduce the size of the variable display area from a current size to the first size in response to input from the user input device (see par. 0002-0004, 0032-0035). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings for the simple purpose of permitting the user to control the screen output to his desired configuration.

As to claim 87, Elsmore disclose a device wherein the first information content is a text message comprising alphanumeric characters (see col. 1, lines 12-27).

As to claim 89, Elsmore discloses a device wherein the number of alphanumeric characters that are displayed in a line of the information content is changed without

increasing the number of alphanumeric characters in the displayed information content, and without reducing the number of alphanumeric characters in the displayed information content [changes only the columns] (see col. 3, lines 32 – col. 5, line 59).

As to claim 91, Elsmore discloses a device wherein the processor is configured, when changing the size of a current display area from a current size to the indicated size, to disable a portion of the display outside the changed display area (see fig. 1, item 14; col. 3, lines 32 – col. 5, line 59).

14. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elsmore in view of Sameshima as applied to claim 86 above, and further in view of Abkowitz.

As to claim 63, the prior references fails to disclose a device further comprising at least one input key associated with a display; wherein the display is configured to display control content, adjacent the input key, indicating its function and wherein the control content remains adjacent the input key when the display area is reduced. In an another analogous art, Abkowitz discloses a device further comprising at least one input key associated with a display; wherein the display is configured to display control content, adjacent the input key, indicating its function (see par. 0042) and wherein the control content remains adjacent the input key when the display area is reduced (since the virtual device is going to emulate the respective device, if the next resized device have soft keys, it will remain adjacent to their respective button, see fig. 4; par. 0042). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time

of the invention to combine the teachings for the simple purpose of truthful emulation of the desired device.

15. Claim 72 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elsmore in view of Abkowitz.

As to claim 72, the prior reference fails to disclose a device further comprising at least one input key associated with a display; wherein the display is configured to display control content, adjacent the input key, indicating its function and wherein the control content remains adjacent the input key when the display area is reduced. In another analogous art, Abkowitz discloses a device further comprising at least one input key associated with a display; wherein the display is configured to display control content, adjacent the input key, indicating its function (see par. 0042) and wherein the control content remains adjacent the input key when the display area is reduced (since the virtual device is going to emulate the respective device, if the next resized device have soft keys, it will remain adjacent to their respective button, see fig. 4; par. 0042). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings for the simple purpose of truthful emulation of the desired device.

16. Claims 64 and 66-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elsmore and Sameshima in view of Ali.

As to claim 64, Elsmore discloses a device wherein the information content has a predetermined and fixed orientation with respect to the display area (see col. 3, line 32 – col. 4, line 34). The prior references do not specifically disclose that a variation in the display area produces a concomitant variation in the orientation of the information content. In an analogous art, Ali discloses that a variation in the variable display area produces a concomitant variation in the orientation of the information content in response to input from the user input device (see fig. 8b and 8c, par. 0066-0070). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to maintain the same order of the input keys, thereby providing the user an easy to learn user interface regardless of the position of the device.

As to claim 66, the prior references do not specifically disclose a device wherein the processor in response to an input from the user input devices changes the orientation of the display area from a first one of a predetermined orientation to a second one of the plurality of orientations. In an analogous art, Ali disclose a device wherein the processor in response to an input from the user input devices changes the orientation of the display area from a first one of a predetermined orientation to a second one of the plurality of orientations (see fig. 8b and 8c, par. 0066-0070). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to rotate the Ali display to either side and maintain the same order of the input keys by inverting the sequence of the control content, thereby providing the user an easy to learn user interface regardless of the position of the device.

As to claim 67, the prior references do not specifically disclose a device wherein the processor is configured to vary the user-determined orientation of the display area by successive increments of 90 degrees rotation about a first origin in the display. Ali discloses a device wherein the processor is configured to vary the user-determined orientation of the display area by successive increments of 90 degrees rotation about a first origin in the display (see fig. 8b and 8c, par. 0066-0070). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to rotate the Ali display to either side and maintain the same order of the input keys by inverting the sequence of the control content, thereby providing the user an easy to learn user interface regardless of the position of the device.

As to claim 68, Sameshima discloses a device as claimed in claim wherein the processor, configured to vary the size of the display area while the information content is displayed therein (see par. 0018-0020, 0032-0037). Ali discloses a device as claimed in claim wherein the processor, configured to vary the orientation of the display area while the information content is displayed therein (see fig. 8b and 8c, par. 0066-0070). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to rotate the Ali display to either side and maintain the same order of the input keys by inverting the sequence of the control content, thereby providing the user an easy to learn user interface regardless of the position of the device.

As to claim 69, Elsmore discloses a device wherein the display has a plurality of edges (see fig. 1, item 14). The prior references do not disclose the control content is fixedly positioned at one edge of the display. In analogous art, Ali discloses a device

wherein the display has a plurality of edges and the control content is fixedly positioned at one edge of the display (see fig. 8b and 8c, par. 0066-0070). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to maintain the same order of the input keys, thereby providing the user an easy to learn user interface regardless of the position of the device.

As to claim 70, the prior references do not disclose a device wherein the processor is configured to rotate the display area about a first axis and simultaneously rotate the control content about a second axis, by ninety degrees in response to a input from the user input device. Ali discloses a device wherein the processor is configured to rotate the display area about a first axis and simultaneously rotate the control content about a second axis, by ninety degrees in response to a input from the user input device (see fig. 8b and 8c, par. 0066-0070). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to maintain the same order of the input keys, thereby providing the user an easy to learn user interface regardless of the position of the device.

17. Claim 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elsmore in view of Larson.

As to claim 73, Elsmore discloses a device as claimed in claim wherein the processor, configured to vary the size of the display area while the information content is displayed therein see col. 3, line 32 – col. 4, line 34; col. 4, lines 58 – col. 5, line 59). The prior reference does not teach a device wherein the processor, configured to vary

the orientation of the display area while the information content is displayed therein.

Larson discloses a device wherein the processor, configured to vary the orientation of the display area while the information content is displayed therein (col. 8, lines 15–60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to rotate the Ali display to either side and maintain the same order of the input keys by inverting the sequence of the control content, thereby providing the user an easy to learn user interface regardless of the position of the device.

18. Claim 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elsmore in view of Abkowitz as applied to claim 72 above, and further in view of Larson.

As to claim 74, Elsmore discloses a device as claimed in claim wherein the processor, configured to vary the size of the display area while the information content is displayed therein see col. 3, line 32 – col. 4, line 34; col. 4, lines 58 – col. 5, line 59).

The prior references do not teach a device wherein the processor, configured to vary the orientation of the display area while the information content is displayed therein.

Larson discloses a device wherein the processor, configured to vary the orientation of the display area while the information content is displayed therein (col. 8, lines 15–60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to rotate the Ali display to either side and maintain the same order of the input keys by inverting the sequence of the control content, thereby providing the user an easy to learn user interface regardless of the position of the device.

Conclusion

Any response to this Office Action should be mailed to:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

571-273-8300

for formal communication intended for entry, informal communication or draft communication; in the case of informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARCOS L. TORRES whose telephone number is (571)272-7926. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-252-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marcos L Torres/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617